



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 22, 2019

Mr. Fernando C. Gomez
Vice Chancellor and General Counsel
The Texas State University System
601 Colorado Street
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2019-29709

Dear Mr. Gomez:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 792680 (PIR 19-023).

The Texas State University System (the "system") received a request for yearly evaluations of a specified individual for a specified period of time. The system states it has redacted student-identifying information from the submitted documents pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.¹ We understand the system will redact information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code, as permitted by section 552.024(c) of the Government Code.²

¹ The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or student consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

²Section 552.117 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, emergency contact information, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117. Section 552.024 of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to withhold information subject to section 552.117 without

You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.104, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request because it does not consist of the requested yearly evaluations of the named individual. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the system is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Next, we note the responsive information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Id. § 552.022(a)(1). The responsive information consists of evaluations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The system must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although you raise section 552.111 of the Government Code for the responsive information, this exception is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Therefore, the system may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, information encompassed by section 552.022 may be withheld under section 552.104. *See* Gov't Code § 552.104(b) (information protected by section 552.104 not subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022(a)). Additionally, because sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.1235 of the Government Code can make information confidential under the Act, we will also address your arguments under these sections.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov't Code

requesting a decision from this office if the employee or official or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See id.* § 552.024(c).

§ 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find the system has not demonstrated any of the responsive information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the system may not withhold any portion of the responsive information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). After review of the information at issue, we find the system has not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the system may not withhold any of the responsive information at issue under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). We understand the system to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is discussed above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert's* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Upon review, we find no portion of the responsive information

is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the system may not withhold it on that basis.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). A private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder’s [or competitor’s information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Id.* at 841. Although the system asserts section 552.104 for some of the responsive information, we find you have failed to establish the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the system may not withhold any of the responsive information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.1235 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[t]he name or other information that would tend to disclose the identity of a person, other than a governmental body, who makes a gift, grant, or donation of money or property to an institution of higher education[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.1235(a). For purposes of this exception, “institution of higher education” is defined by section 61.003 of the Education Code. *Id.* § 552.1235(c). Section 61.003 defines an “institution of higher education” as meaning “any public technical institute, public junior college, public senior college or university, medical or dental unit, public state college, or other agency of higher education as defined in this section.” Educ. Code § 61.003(8). Because section 552.1235 does not provide a definition of “person,” we look to the definition provided in the Code Construction Act. *See* Gov’t Code § 311.005. “Person” includes a corporation, organization, government or governmental subdivision or agency, business trust, estate, trust, partnership, association, and any other legal entity. *Id.* § 311.005(2). You state the information you marked identifies donors to the system. You state the donors at issue have not consented to release of their identifying information. Thus, the system must withhold the donors’ identifying information you marked under section 552.1235 of the Government Code.

In summary, the system must withhold the donors’ identifying information you marked under section 552.1235 of the Government Code. The system must release the remaining responsive information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable

charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Paige Lay". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/mo

Ref: ID# 792680

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)